

REMARKS

Abstract

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract for perceived phrases or words that “can be implied.” In particular, the Examiner objects to the use of the word “disclosed” in the Abstract.

Applicant believes that the words “disclosed” and “disclosure” are distinguishable, and that the latter is the only explicitly referenced in ¶6.16 of MPEP §608.01(b). Notably, the word “disclosed” is frequently used in abstract language. Indeed, a search of the USPTO database for *issued patents alone* returned 363,397 results for abstracts containing the word “disclose.” Even in this practitioner’s ten years of practice, he has not seen a single rejection to the word “disclose.” Accordingly, reconsideration of this objection is requested.

Claim Amendments:

Please amend claims 1, 3, 5, 6, and 7 as specified above. Please also cancel claims 2, 4, and 8. Finally, please add claims 9-24 as set forth above. Applicant states that no new matter is added by way of this amendment.

Claim Rejections:

The Examiner has first rejected claims 3-4 based on the inconsistency of “housing” and “housing portion.” Applicant has amended claim 1, from which claims 3 and 4 depend, to correct the inconsistency. Applicant believes this amendment places

the claims in a consistent manner and in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the withdrawal of this rejection.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 7 based on perceived anticipation by Lee. The Examiner has further rejected claims 5-6 and 8 based on perceived obviousness over Lee.

As an initial matter, it is noted that Lee relates to “an apparatus for connecting a laptop computer to a communications network.” (Pg. 1, ¶5). According to Lee, “The cord reel assembly 14 is configured for mounting within a headrest of a passenger seat.” (Pg. 1, ¶12).

Among other things, Lee does not contemplate the problems overcome by the claimed invention – namely how to route cables between passenger seat rows when the seat rows may not always maintain the same distance between each other. Moreover, Lee addresses a different portion of the path of a data signal. Specifically, Lee addresses the last few feet of cable that extend between a seat and a passenger. This is in contrast to the present invention, which addresses the cables as they are routed throughout the passenger vehicle – i.e. between seats and other connection points.

Moreover, the amended claims make Lee even more distinguishable from the presently claimed invention. Lee does not relate to a “cable routing system” wherein the multi-conductor cable is configured to convey electrical signals between at least one of the rows of seats and a second one of the rows of seats. For all of these reasons, Applicant asserts that Lee does not anticipate or make obvious the present invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner’s withdrawal of the rejections based on Lee.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1 and 4 based on perceived obviousness over Wei. In light of the amendments proposed herein and the arguments offered above, the Applicant believes the claimed invention is not obvious over Wei. In particular, Wei fails to teach or make obvious first and second connectors coupled a multi-conductor cable, signals being conveyed between two rows of seats, and a cable housing configured to be mounted underneath at least one of the passenger seats. Because none of these elements can be found in Wei, Applicant believes the obviousness rejection based on Wei should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests the same.

For all of the above reasons, the Applicant believes the 102 and 103 rejections based on Lee and Wei are overcome. Reconsideration of the above-identified patent application is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further comments or questions, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,



Christopher E. Haigh
Registered Patent Attorney
#46,377
Counsel for Applicant
312-242-1685
f: 312-277-9002